



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,566	12/11/2006	Frank Hartung	P18484-US1	2820
27045	7590	04/23/2010	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			STU, SARAH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2431	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/23/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

melissa.wingo@ericsson.com

kara.coffman@ericsson.com

jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/595,566

Applicant(s)

HARTUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Sarah Su

Art Unit

2431

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 April 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/28)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/27/06, 1/19/07, 8/5/08
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Preliminary Amendment, received on 27 April 2006, has been entered into record. In this amendment, claims 1-12, 15-22, and 24 have been amended, and claims 25-28 have been canceled.
2. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Priority

3. The claim for priority from PCT/EP03/12141 filed on 31 October 2003 is duly noted.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement filed 27 April 2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. In the Abstract, line 6: "for the defined usage rights, the content" should read –for the defined usage rights, and the content–;

- b. In the Abstract, lines 9-18: "The encrypted content, usage rights... are sent to the recipient device to verify the integrity of the defined usage rights based on the integrity protection information, decrypting the encrypted content encryption key... , applying the defined usage rights..., and using the content..." is unclear.
 - c. In page 17, line 17: "de-fact standardized solution" should read –de-facto standardized solution–;
 - d. In page 17, line 25: "in form of usage restrictions" should read –in the form of usage restrictions–;
 - e. In page 17, line 26: "in addition usage rights" should read –in addition, usage rights–;
 - f. In page 24, line 32: "Message 120" should read –Message X120–.
- Appropriate correction is required.
- 6. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.
 - 7. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

8. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- a. In claim 3, line 2: "comprising the step" should read —comprising a step—.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

9. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: DB2 (Figure 5b). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 11-15 are directed to an apparatus, but the independent claim from which the claims depend recite a method. This renders the claims indefinite because the claims have not distinctly claimed if the claims are directed to a method or an apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

13. Claims 20, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ginter et al. (US Patent 5,917,912 and Ginter hereinafter).

As to claim 20, Ginter discloses a system and method for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection, the system and method having:

at least a receiving unit and processing unit, wherein the receiving unit is adapted to receive the content being encrypted by a content encryption key, at least one defined usage right specifying one or more usage restrictions and/or usage permissions of the content and the at least one defined usage right comprising a temporal restriction, a content encryption key being encrypted by a key encryption key associated with

the recipient device and/or an operator of the recipient device, and integrity protection information for the at least one defined usage right (col. 9, lines 19-24; col. 17, lines 42-51; col. 21, lines 62-67; col. 22, lines 1-12; col. 62, lines 15-17, 31-34),

the processing unit is adapted to verify the integrity of the at least one usage right based on the integrity protection information (col. 215, lines 43-51, 60-63), to decrypt the encrypted content encryption key with a decryption key corresponding to the key encryption key (col. 210, lines 18-22), to decrypt the encrypted content with the content encryption key in a secure environment (col. 210, lines 22-25), to apply the at least one defined usage right to the content in the secure environment (col. 53, lines 45-63), and to use the content according to the applied at least one defined usage right (col. 53, lines 45-63).

As to claim 21, Ginter discloses:

wherein the processing unit is adapted to generate an alert if the integrity of the at least one defined usage right is violated and to initiate an indication of the alert at an output unit (col. 237, lines 33-37).

As to claim 24, Ginter discloses:

wherein the receiving unit is adapted to receive the at least one defined usage right and associated authorization information indicating a

rights issuer authorization from a rights server and the processing unit is adapted to verify the rights issuer authorization based on the received authorization information (col. 14, lines 35-39; col. 55, lines 45-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

16. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Kawell et al. (WO 00/20950 and Kawell hereinafter).

As to claim 22, Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

a transmission unit and the processing unit is adapted to restrict or block or delete the at least one defined usage right before the temporal restriction expires and to generate an indication of the restricting or the blocking or the deleting, and the transmission unit is adapted to send the indication to the user device.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Kawell.

Kawell discloses a system and method for distributing access to a data item, the system and method having:

a transmission unit and the processing unit is adapted to restrict or block or delete the at least one defined usage right before the temporal restriction expires and to generate an indication of the restricting or the blocking or the deleting, and the transmission unit is adapted to send the indication to the user device (page 12, lines 26-32; page 13, lines 1-6).

Given the teaching of Kawell, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Kawell by restricting a right before expiration. Kawell recites motivation by disclosing that data may be lent by a library for a specific period of time in order to allow that the digital data may be transferred between multiple computers while ensuring a single instance of permission (page 1, lines 24-27), similar to a physical rental of a book. In the instance of a physical library, a

book renter may return the book to the library prior to the expiration of the rental period, thus transferring back the permission to the library. It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Kawell to the teachings of Ginter by restricting a right before expiration of a restriction in order to permit the user to return a borrowed item early.

As to claim 23, Ginter discloses:

wherein the processing unit is adapted to generate at least one received usage right that is a subset of the at least one defined usage right for the indication (col. 156, lines 18-26).

17. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter in view of Kawell.

As to claim 1, Ginter discloses:

obtaining the content at the user device from the protected content in accordance with the one or more first usage rights by decrypting the protected content by a first content encryption key in a first secure environment of the user device and by accessing the decrypted content in the first secure environment (col. 9, lines 19-24; col. 17, lines 42-51; col. 21, lines 62-67; col. 22, lines 1-12),

defining at least one usage right at the user device, the at least one defined usage right specifying one or more usage restrictions and/or one or more usage permissions of the content at a recipient device and the at

least one defined usage right comprising a temporal restriction (col. 152, lines 45-52; col. 156, lines 18-26),

verifying that the at least one defined usage right is a subset of the one or more first usage rights (col. 156, lines 18-26),

generating at the user device integrity protection information for the at least one defined usage right (col. 215, lines 43-51; col. 216, lines 6-8),

encrypting the content with a content encryption key (col. 215, lines 2-5),

encrypting the content encryption key with a key encryption key associated with the recipient device and/or an operator of the recipient device (col. 128, lines 61-67; col. 129, lines 1-2),

communicating the encrypted content, the at least one defined usage right, the encrypted content encryption key, and the integrity protection information to the recipient device (col. 126, lines 48-56),

restricting the one or more first usage rights in consequence of the definition and/or the communication of the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device (col. 67, lines 25-29),

verifying at the recipient device the integrity of the at least one defined usage right based on the integrity protection information (col. 215, lines 43-51, 60-63),

decrypting at the recipient device the encrypted content encryption key with a decryption key corresponding to the key encryption key (col.

210, lines 18-22),

decrypting the encrypted content with the content encryption key in a secure environment of the recipient device (col. 210, lines 22-25),

applying the at least one defined usage right to the content in the secure environment (col. 53, lines 45-63),

using the content at the recipient device according to the applied at least one usage right (col. 53, lines 45-63).

Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

abolishing the restriction of the one or more first usage rights when the temporal restriction expires.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Kawell.

Kawell discloses:

abolishing the restriction of the one or more first usage rights when the temporal restriction expires (page 1, lines 28-32; page 12, lines 29-32; page 13, lines 1-6).

Given the teaching of Kawell, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Kawell by abolishing a restriction when it expires. Kawell recites motivation by disclosing that transferring permissions instead of

copying permissions allows for multiple transfers between computers while maintaining a single instance of permission (page 1, lines 24-27). It is obvious that the teachings of Kawell would have improved the teachings of Ginter by abolishing a restriction after expiration in order to allow multiple transfers of permissions while ensuring that only one computer may have access at any given time.

As to claim 2, Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

**restricting or blocking or deleting the at least one defined usage
right at the recipient device before the expiry of the temporal restriction,
communicating an indication of the restricting or blocking or
deleting to the user device.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Kawell.

Kawell discloses:

**restricting or blocking or deleting the at least one defined usage
right at the recipient device before the expiry of the temporal restriction**
(page 12, lines 26-32; page 13, lines 1-6),
**communicating an indication of the restricting or blocking or
deleting to the user device** (page 2, lines 25-29).

Given the teaching of Kawell, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Kawell by restricting a right before

expiration of a restriction. Please refer to the motivation recited above with respect to claim 22 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Kawell to the teachings of Ginter.

As to claim 3, Ginter discloses:

generating by the recipient device at least one received usage right that is a subset of the at least one defined usage right for the indication
(col. 156, lines 18-26).

As to claim 4, Ginter discloses:

applying the at least one received usage right at the user device until the expiry of the temporal restriction (col. 152, lines 45-54).

As to claim 5, Ginter discloses:

recognizing by the user device that the at least one received usage right relates to the at least one defined usage right (col. 55, lines 66-67).

Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

using the content at the user device according to the at least one first usage right even within the time upon the expiration of the temporal restriction.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Kawell.

Kawell discloses:

using the content at the user device according to the at least one first usage right even within the time upon the expiration of the temporal restriction (page 12, lines 29-32; page 13, lines 1-6).

Given the teaching of Kawell, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Kawell by accessing the data after expiration of a restriction at a user device. Please refer to the motivation recites above with respect to claim 1 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Kawell to the teachings of Ginter.

As to claim 6, Ginter discloses:

wherein the step of communicating the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device is executed by communicating the at least one defined usage right from the user device to a rights server (col. 55, lines 39-43),

associating by the rights server the at least one defined usage right with authorization information indicating a rights issuer authorization for the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device (col. 55, lines 45-51),

communicating the at least one defined usage right and the authorization information from the rights server to the recipient device, and

the recipient device verifies the rights issuer authorization based on the received authorization information (col. 14, lines 35-39; col. 55, lines 52-56).

As to claim 7, Ginter discloses:

communicating to a charging server an indication about the communication of the at least one defined usage right (col. 55, lines 57-61).

As to claim 8, Ginter discloses:

wherein an input unit of the user device D receives at least one instruction from a user for defining the at least one usage right (col. 16, lines 17-20; col. 60, lines 31-36).

As to claim 9, Ginter discloses:

defining at least one further usage right for at least one further recipient device for controlling the usage of the content at the at least one further device (col. 16, lines 14-20).

As to claim 11, Ginter discloses:

the user device being adapted to load the protected content via a receiving unit and to store the protected content at a storage and/or to store pre-installed protected content at the storage (col. 58, lines 57-62; col. 62, lines 64-65).

As to claim 12, Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

a receiving unit and the receiving unit is adapted to receive an indication of a restricting or a blocking or a deleting of the at least one defined usage rights at the recipient device before the expiry of the temporal restriction.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Kawell.

Kawell discloses:

a receiving unit and the receiving unit is adapted to receive an indication of a restricting or a blocking or a deleting of the at least one defined usage rights at the recipient device before the expiry of the temporal restriction (page 2, lines 25-29; page 12, lines 26-32; page 13, lines 1-6).

Given the teaching of Kawell, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Kawell by restricting a right before expiration of a restriction. Please refer to the motivation recited above with respect to claim 22 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Kawell to the teachings of Ginter.

As to claim 13, Ginter discloses:

wherein the indication comprises at least one received usage right that is a subset of the at least one defined usage right (col. 156, lines 18-26).

As to claim 14, Ginter discloses:

wherein the processing unit is adapted to apply the at least one received usage right until the expiry of the temporal restriction (col. 152, lines 45-54).

As to claim 15, Ginter discloses:

the user device being adapted to recognize that the at least one received usage right relates to the at least one defined usage right (col. 55, lines 66-67).

Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

to use the content according to the at least one first usage right even within the time upon the expiration of the temporal restriction.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Kawell.

Kawell discloses:

to use the content according to the at least one first usage right even within the time upon the expiration of the temporal restriction (page 12, lines 29-32; page 13, lines 1-6).

Given the teaching of Kawell, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Kawell by using the content according to rights after expiration of the restriction. Please refer to the motivation recited above with respect to claim 5 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Kawell to the teachings of Ginter.

As to claim 10, Ginter discloses:

at least a transmission unit and a processing unit, wherein protected content exists being usage restricted by one or more first usage rights specifying one or more usage restrictions and/or one or more usage permissions of the protected content at the user device (col. 9, lines 19-24; col. 17, lines 42-51; col. 62, lines 15-17, 31-34),

the processing unit being adapted to obtain the content from the protected content in accordance with the one or more first usage rights by decrypting the protected content with a first content encryption key in a first secure environment of the user device and by accessing the decrypted content in the first secure environment (col. 9, lines 19-24; col. 17, lines 42-51; col. 21, lines 62-67; col. 22, lines 1-12), **to define at least one usage right specifying one or more usage restrictions and/or one or more usage permissions of the content at the recipient device, the at least one defined usage right comprising a temporal restriction** (col. 152, lines 45-52; col. 156,

lines 18-26), **to verify that the at least one defined usage right is a subset of the one or more first usage rights** (col. 156, lines 18-26), **to generate integrity protection information for the at least one defined usage right** (col. 215, lines 43-51; col. 216, lines 6-8)), **to encrypt the content with a content encryption key** (col. 215, lines 2-5), **to encrypt the content encryption key with a key encryption key associated with the recipient device and/or an operator of the recipient device** (col. 128, lines 61-67; col. 129, lines 1-2), **the transmission unit being adapted to send the encrypted content, the at least one defined usage right, the encrypted content encryption key, and the integrity protection information to the recipient device** (col. 126, lines 48-56), **and the processing unit being adapted to restrict the one or more first usage rights in consequence of the definition and/or the communication of the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device** (col. 67, lines 25-29).

Ginter fails to specifically disclose:

to abolish the restriction of the one or more first usage rights the when temporal restriction expires.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Ginter, as taught by Kawell.

Kawell discloses:

to abolish the restriction of the one or more first usage rights the when temporal restriction expires (page 1, lines 28-32; page 12, lines 29-32; page 13, lines 1-6).

Given the teaching of Kawell, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Ginter with the teachings of Kawell by abolishing the restriction upon expiration. Please refer to the motivation recited above with respect to claim 1 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Kawell to the teachings of Ginter.

As to claim 16, Ginter discloses:

wherein the processing unit is adapted to generate an instruction for a rights server to associate the at least one defined usage right with authorization information indicating a rights issuer authorization for the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device and to communicate the at least one defined usage right and the authorization information to the recipient device, and the transmission unit is adapted send the instruction and the at least one defined usage right to the rights server (col. 14, lines 35-39; col. 55, lines 39-56).

As to claim 17, Ginter discloses:

wherein the transmission unit is adapted to send to a charging server an indication about the communication of the at least one defined usage right to the recipient device (col. 55, lines 57-61).

As to claim 18, Ginter discloses:

an input unit which is adapted to receive at least one instruction from a user and the processing unit is adapted to define the at least one usage right based on the at least one instruction from the user (col. 16, lines 17-20; col. 60, lines 31-36).

As to claim 19, Ginter discloses:

wherein the processing unit is adapted to define at least one further usage right for at least one further recipient device for controlling the usage of the content at the at least one further recipient device (col. 16, lines 14-20).

Prior Art Made of Record

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Banerjee et al. (US 2003/0004885 A1) discloses a system and method for digital rights management.

- b. Bjorkengren et al. (US Patent 7,617,158 B2) discloses a system and method for digital rights management of electronic content.
- c. Gilliam et al. (US Patent 7,206,765 B2) discloses a system and method for supplying and managing usage rights based on rules.
- d. Niebert et al. (US 2007/0271184 A1) discloses a system and method for transferring media data files.
- e. Peinado et al. (US Patent 6,772,340 B1) discloses a system and method for digital rights management on a computing device.
- f. Rahnasto (US 2002/0091642 A1) discloses a system and method for the distribution of content.
- g. Verosub et al. (US 2004/0205028 A1) discloses a system and method for digital content storing.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah Su whose telephone number is (571) 270-3835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William R. Korzuch/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Sarah Su/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431